DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 025 371 95 RC 003 118

By- Lynch, Patrick D.

Training Mexican American School Principals: An Analysis of a Program's Hits and Misses.

New Mexico State Univ., University Park. ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.
Spons Agency- Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
Pub Date Feb 69
Grant- OEG-0-9-411906-1714-721
Note- 24p.; Paper prepared for the Conf. on Teacher Educ. for Mexican Americans, New Mexico State Univ., February 13-15, 1969.
Available from- Manager, Dup. Serv., NMSU, P.O. Box 3CB, Las Cruces, N.M. 88001 ($1.00, over 5 copies $0.85 each)
EDRS Price MF- $0.25 HC- $1.30
Descriptors- *Administrator Role, *Change Agents, *Educational Programs, Institutions, *Mexican Americans, Observation, *Principals, Program Evaluation, Rural Areas, Trainees

A National Institute of Mental Health project was initiated in 1964 at the University of New Mexico to prepare educational administrators to become community change agents. The 10 fellows appointed to the program received training in applications of the social sciences to administration, with concentration on concepts of community organization and structure, culture, social factors, change, power, and the nature and dynamics of organizations. Internships in communities and State agencies provided opportunities for the fellows to observe, and be a part of, the change process. Although a few of the 10 fellows returned to public school positions following completion of their programs, by 1968 none of them were public school administrators. (BR)

TRAINING MEXICAN AMERICAN SCHOOL PRINCIPALS: AN ANALYSIS OF A PROGRAM'S HITS AND MISSES

PATRICK D. LYNCH

Prepared for the Conference
on Training Educational

NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY

ED025377

RC 003 118

ERIC
CRESS

TRAINING MEXICAN AMERICAN SCHOOL PRINCIPALS: AN ANALYSIS OF A PROGRAM'S HITS AND MISSES

by

PATRICK D. LYNCH

ED025371

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER
CLEARINGHOUSE ON RURAL EDUCATION AND SMALL SCHOOLS

New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001

February 1969

This monograph was prepared pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

TRAINING MEXICAN AMERICAN SCHOOL PRINCIPALS: AN ANALYSIS OF A PROGRAM'S HITS AND MISSES

Foreword

The topic of this paper is the preparation of Mexican American school principals. The preparation of Mexican American school principals demands a change in preparation systems, if school administrators are to be prepared to lead schools in multi-cultural communities. The dynamics of change can most clearly be observed in the setting of an institution, its social environment. This paper reviews an attempt to change part of an institution and the unanticipated consequences of that attempt. Change in an institutional setting does not refer to regulative or bureaucratic rearrangements but to program changes related to changed goals. Change in an institution demands that the actors play legitimate roles in that institution, that the goals be those which will not destroy the institution's basic relationships with society, and that the actors dedicated to changing the institution remain to carry out, in part at least, the desired change.

This paper is written by a participant-observer, in this case the director of the first two years of the program described herein. This is not so much an attempt to describe a program that both succeeded and failed, but is an effort to apply to the problem at hand some lessons learned from that program.

Introduction

The University of New Mexico has had a reputation for an outstanding department of anthropology and excellent departments of physics, foreign languages, geology, history, and English. In the 1960's the University began to improve markedly its faculties of psychology, mathematics, law, economics, and business administration, as well as that of the College of Education. With a major effort it simultaneously began to organize an excellent school of medicine.

The University reflected the multi-culture in its student body, but not in its faculty. A few Spanish people, but no Indians nor Negroes, had attained professorships. The University's intellectual climate was free-wheeling, but the school more nearly resembled an ivy-league college than a Big-Ten, development-oriented institution.

The University's lack of involvement in state problems began to change in the 1960's with the foundation of a medical school and incentives from Federal "great society" legislation. But within the College of Education, a division of opinion developed concerning these very programs. Some professors wanted the College to do as little as possible with Federal money; others were anxious to use Federal money to change the State's educational system; still others did not care if Federal aid came or not.[1] Less controversial in the institution, but parallel with it, was the effort to become a center for Latin American development. It was often stated by those interested in involving the University in State development, "how appropriate it was to have the University of an underdeveloped State play host to programs for underdeveloped countries."

In 1963 a group of professors of the University of New Mexico Department of Educational Administration submitted an idea for training school administrators to the National Institute of Mental Health. The idea was that school administrators create a climate for learning in their building or district. Halpin's work on administrative climate was new at that time, and seemed to have relevance to mental health. To the degree that a school has an open climate, professional people in the school are treated as hard-working equals working toward certain goals, according to Halpin. It was hypothesized that an open climate might also be one where everyone felt self-respect because his culture was recognized as an important contributing factor in the neighborhood, the State, and the Nation. If the curriculum reflected this respect, the child would feel that the school was not an alien country trying to change him into another kind of person, but was a community of different people respecting each other and trading strengths. A training program was constructed which attempted to prepare administrators to change schools and school systems toward the kind of open climate which would be conducive to good mental health. Such administrators could use the multi-cultural conceptual background anywhere in the nation to good advantage. The National Institute of Mental Health in 1964 approved the proposal, and in September of that year the program began with ten trainees.

The training of the multi-cultural program for administrators at the University of New Mexico emphasized the application of the social sciences to administration, with concentration on the concepts of community organization and structure, the nature of culture, cultural variability, phenomena of change in society and institutions, conflict, power dynamics, social structure and function, family structure, and the nature and dynamics of organizations. Instead of the traditional treatment of school finance in a "how to" course, the relationship of economics in public and private sectors to education was treated, along with application to the system in being. A course on school buildings laid emphasis on community and school planning. Internships in communities and in state organizations were a major part of the plan. In the first semester, fellows were trained in community observation techniques. They were sent into communities the next semester for the purpose of analyzing social and power structures. The fellows, in the third semester, served observer and actor roles in state government and lobbying organizations in the State capital. They reported their experiences during the fourth semester. During the first summer, most of the fellows worked on a project relating to community activity or regional activity—usually an OEO sponsored project described later in the paper.

Conceptual and Organizational Bases

Possibly the most fundamental feature of any program is its basis in the minds of its creators. In this case the creators of the program were a small group of faculty in the Department of Educational Administration. A climate of change generated among staff prepared the way not only for a program but for a number of changes in emphasis. This project was conceived not as a way of relieving the Federal Government of some easy

money but as a road map for an entire administrator training program. It was designed to be the way to train future administrators at UNM. The components of this plan were:

a. concepts which required not only education skills but broad (and deep) social science background for proper use in an administrative role;
b. concentration not on the school alone as a social system but on the school as a social system in interaction with the community and region. This included the notion that power forces affect the school and influence its program;
c. recognition of the school-community as a system interacting with a complex of cultures, and that the school-community must change together. This concept replaced the model of the school as an Anglo middle-class fortress attracting the "best minds" to it and casting off the rest as flotsam. In plain words, the organizational behavior of the school as we knew it had to be changed;
d. the necessity for administrator trainees to obtain "gut feeling" as well as cognitive approaches to community structure. This required "living in" the community—which brought problems as well as rewards;
e. a willingness to deal pragmatically with administrator training rather than as we usually do, intuitively. If something worked well, it was kept; if not, it was eliminated or changed;
f. a hope that this conceptual road map for training administrators would not only be the one in use after three years for training all administrators, but would spread to the rest of the College of Education for possible use in counselor and teacher training. In this we were doomed to disappointment; we failed to realize how difficult it is to change a college of education; and
g. administrators have to become change agents. This also means they have to accept consequences of being a change agent which are not always pleasant.

The formation of the concepts underlying the program was a most basic process. It gave the staff in administration a common reference area. Out of this reference area came not only three years of work in the program but several side effects. Among these side effects was the recognition that cultural variability needed to be recognized in new educational organizations which were being formed in the days of the great society, 1964-68. So it happened that the members of the program staff contributed in varying ways to the formulation of the Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory and the Educational Service Center in Albuquerque. The Chairman of the Department of Educational Administration (the department housing the NIMH program) was instrumental in forming the Southwestern Cooperative Educational Lab and became its first director. The director of the NIMH program later became the Director of the Educational Service Center.

The original team members consisted of the Department Chairman, Paul Petty, who constantly encouraged new ideas and pushed members of the Department to greater activity in operationalizing ideas, and a New Mexico native, Frank Angel, who had worked twenty-five years previously in the first community school in the State and

whose whole intellectual upbringing had been experimental. From six years at the College of Guam came Jim Cooper, a man with a fine research background in exactly the kind of problem which excited everyone else in the Department—the effect of cultural variability on school-related ability and achievement. Another member of the team, the author of this paper, was a Midwesterner who had years before worked with migrant sugarbeet workers in Minnesota and held deep Southwestern sympathies ever since. A visitor to the summer session of 1963 helped greatly—Frank Lutz had headed the Abo underground school research project and had plenty of energy as well as a sympathy for the focus of the team.

Change teams in universities must realize that the climate changes as more inputs are added and that the whole complexion of the team can change as this happens. So it did here. As Federal money was used to add staff, more people came into the training situation—this enlarged and changed the training focus somewhat. For example, one new staff member in 1964 (the year the project began) was an expert in group dynamics. It was his idea to use group counseling. This widened the scope of the training activity and added problems, but the staff and the fellows were the more experienced for it afterwards. It gave the staff a valuable tool which was used well the first year and poorly thereafter, when that particular expert left the University.

Any team which conceptualizes an effort and then includes others so as to carry out that effort is bound to change its point of view somewhat as the "newcomers" have their effects. The game as played is never exactly what it was when it was first written. The more players, the more changes occur. The director has to keep refocusing on the original document, and has to try to keep the staff together on what the goals are or ought to be. The staff collectively was bound to change at least somewhat the original goals as the training process began and feedback from trainees occurred.

Trainee Selection

The first ten fellows were selected on the assumptions that experience in education (3 years) was important, and that administrative experience was not necessary (half had had some administrative experience). Further, the trainees should be as open as possible to change. As representative a group as possible of the Southwest would give the program the different kinds of viewpoint it needed. The first group of ten varied in age from 33 to 48, so it was not really a young group. Eight were Anglos and two were Spanish-speaking.

To some extent, selection was limited by the requirements of the College of Education that all doctoral students have three years teaching experience and that all have a Master's degree. The experience of the program might be briefly summarized with respect to these selection criteria by stating that the three years' teaching requirement had no relevance to the training task. In fact if this requirement were waived a longer list of very able candidates could probably be found for such a program.

Administrative experience was not critical to success and probably would best not be required in another program of this kind. Abstracting from one's experience to

organizational phenomena is difficult at best and is more difficult when one perceives one's past administrative experience as "successful."

Although the academic background of the ten was much broader in terms of the social sciences than that of any other comparable group previously admitted into the College of Education, their backgrounds were nevertheless oriented toward teacher preparation. Each trainee had to do a great amount of collateral reading in the social sciences before he had a background strong enough to take the sociology and anthropology courses in the program.

Age of the trainees cannot be said to have been a significant factor. One of the older fellows turned out to be charismatic and very open. The young fellows included both the extremely bright and the more average intellectually.

Openness to change turned out probably to be the most significant mark of the original ten. As a group they were more anxious to change systems and more risk-oriented than any other comparable group of graduate students in the College of Education. Personality test scores and behavior witness to this statement. One criterion for their selection had been the readiness to suggest several alternatives for solutions of school problems in an interview, and their own expressed personal dissatisfactions with the present state of education. Three of the ten, for example, are in positions at present where there is no guarantee of future employment, and where there are really no contracts in the usual sense.

The Program

A major attempt at fusing the group of ten into one tightly knit group turned out to be less than a success. During the first semester the fellows were assigned a separate study area for their own use, next to the director's office and the seminar area. They were free to use this area for study and informal talk if they wished. An hour each week was set aside for group discussions during which the fellows were to interact with each other and the group dynamics consultant on any agenda they desired. The group consultant's main clinical strength was in group therapy. He worked skillfully with the group in exploring their anxieties regarding the program and each other. The group was pulling together during the first semester and developing a great esprit until the final exams and the prospect of grading appeared.

The group approached the director and asked him to use his influence to give the same grade on all work done so far to all ten fellows. The director asked for staff reaction, and it was negative. When the fellows found out that there would be individual evaluation and that they would therefore be ranked academically, much of the esprit gave way to competition. Where previously two or three fellows would study together and work jointly on a paper, and where a weaker fellow could count on the help of an academically stronger member, now it was everyone for himself. The early esprit was gone. The program to that extent was viewed as being very traditional by the fellows—their full trust in each other vanished, blown away by the need to compete and produce grades.

The fellows were assigned as observers during the first semester to communities which they were to study during the second semester. Instead of using the school as a base of operations or a focal point, there were asked to live in the community but not to go to the school for anything other than one courtesy call. Among communities studied were Jemez Springs, Estancia, Manzano, Mountainair, the Barelas neighborhood of Albuquerque, and Los Lunas. In each case an in-depth study was made and submitted to the director and staff anthropologist at the conclusion of the second semester. Two fellows went into State agencies in Santa Fe, instead of going into communities.

The reports submitted revealed an awareness of social and cultural conflict, perception of school people ranging from hostile through indifferent to a positive force for good in the community. Perception of power resources by the small town people were similar to those reported by Vidich and Bensman in *Small Town in Mass Society.* The people interviewed saw local people as power holders but were unaware of the bigger power holders who manipulated local power figures and who lived in larger communities distant from their locale.

One study of a mountain village was typical.[2] The more remote power figures kept the community in this instance from getting a Federal project which had long been promised to it, bought their land at depressed prices, and held the land without development until such time as a Federal bureau was to be allowed to begin work on the nearby dam. That event would then bring the tourists, cabinbuyers, and summer renters, and increase the value of the property already acquired; a few outsiders rather than the locals would reap the benefits of development. The fact that the local people were unaware of this situation turned their bitterness toward other locals for the lack of development when actually the other locals were impotent and also ignorant of the true source of the "blockage" toward development. Hence, the community was split by bitter feelings while the distant power wielders sat securely waiting for more property to be given up as the town remained destitute. The town nursed a vague grudge against Anglos as Anglos had kept them from getting their development; Anglos had in the 1930's ruined their century-old fruit trees by a WPA scheme at variance with every common sense rule known to nurserymen or fruit farmers. Anglos came in to poke around in ruined homes and to fish in the pond, but did not spend their money. Anglos closed the local school which had dedicated teachers and a low dropout rate, and shipped the children away to an Anglo-dominated school from which their children began to drop out in greater numbers. The school was located in alien land, down in the flat country. Little hope was held out for these people except as they might serve the whims of Anglo tourists—should the dam ever develop.

In the Barelas community the observer became an agent of help and change. Blas Padilla, an older fellow, went into the community as an observer of the elementary school principal who was the leader of that neighborhood. The charismatic principal asked immediately if the University were sending someone in just to look, or whether it intended to help. The fellows, whose role was only to observe, decided after hearing of the Barelas community's problems to help as long as they could.

The Spring of 1965 saw the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act which promised help for neighborhoods like Barelas. The National Institute of Mental Health

fellows under Blas Padilla's leadership wrote applications for what became the Home Improvement Project and the Communication Barriers Project.

The Home Improvement Project was designed to help the young people of the neighborhood who had dropped out of school and had no jobs. They went to literacy classes in the morning, learned basic skills, followed by 4-6 hours of on-the-job training in construction skills taught by foremen. Adobe was the main material employed at first, but later as more houses went up the use of that material became too time-consuming for the task. The homes on which the trainees worked were those of families too poor to improve them out of their own pockets. Along with materials donated by businesses like U.S. Gypsum, Kaiser Industries, lumber companies, and many smaller firms in the area, the labor of the trainees was donated to the householder. The householder would contribute his efforts and whatever money he could borrow on a very limited income. The community nominated trainees and homes of the needy which required improvement. Representatives of the community nominated the most outstanding cases of need and those young men in the area who had, it seemed, no future. The National Institute of Mental Health fellows wrote this project, and under Blas Padilla's and John Seaberg's early efforts it got under way. Desi Baca, the great principal of Barelas, was the living inspiration behind its success.

Later this project spread to other communities in the Albuquerque and Los Lunas area. Under the leadership of people like Joe Romero, Henry Naranjo, Max Saavedra, and Ray Quintana, hundreds of homes were improved and scores of young men were trained and put into jobs.

The Communication Barriers Project, proposed and conducted by Don Croft and the NIMH fellows, was an inquiry into the obstacles keeping the poor of northern New Mexico from the benefits of agencies purporting to serve them. The community itself was studied, as well as the agencies serving it. This study was conducted largely during the summer of 1965 and was summarized by Don Croft, who worked on the NIMH staff in 1965-66 and later became a member of the Regional Educational Laboratory program in the Office of Education in Washington.

Outcomes

The institutional effects can best be examined through the outline of points "a" through "g" used earlier to delineate the nature of the program.

Point "a" was the use of broad (and hopefully deep) social science concepts to train administrators in more than tinkering skills. The administrator to be effective as a change agent must have mental map. To make such a map, he has to have plenty of concepts. He doesn't get those concepts by going through transportation, budget, and pupil accounting manuals or scheduling exercises in Educational Administration courses of the kind still so widely used. He needs to study anthropology, political science, economics, business administration, sociology, psychology, history, architecture, philosophy, and linguistics, to name a few. And he needs to study those on their own ground as well as in the College of Education. He needn't study all those, but some, and

in enough depth to give him ideas and ways of solving the tremendous problems schools are involved in now.

Trying to place educational administrator trainees in courses in other departments causes real problems. University departments like to have their own graduate students studying their own high level courses. Others (outsiders) aren't always welcome and are sometimes discriminated against with low grades. So the interdisciplinary education administrator trainee must feel his way—usually picking his outside courses and instructors very carefully.

The other, bigger problem is relating knowledge from various disciplines to the problems of educational administration, and that's where the administrator trainee is usually on his own. We tried team teaching between an economist and an education finance specialist. It didn't occur—we had parallel teaching but not team teaching; there was no real exchange of ideas between the two profs before the seminar students. In fact, they held separate classes. Team teaching was a success within the department, however, and it occurred all the time.

Departments of educational administration now have survived that kind of interdisciplinary effort and learned to include competence in the social sciences in their own departments by hiring new professors with such background and expertise, but we still will have to expose our trainees to other non-education departments if we wish to secure the best in what is current in those disciplines.

With reference to "b", the school as a system in interaction with other systems, we realized that seeing the school as a social system was no longer new—it is quite a widespread practice among better colleges of education. In fact it is probably an easy, fast measure of a college of education faculty's competence. If this concept is used widely, the faculty is fairly wide awake.

What is a far more rigorous test is the use of interrelated systems in a college or department. That college or department which uses systems in interaction as a conceptual tool consistently is miles ahead of the department which sees the school as a self-sufficient system for the purpose of analysis. The College of Education during the first two years of the program (1964-66) did not share the systems-in-interaction idea. School was seen as a self-sufficient system and teacher training was preparation of the undergraduate for maintaining the system status quo.

If the school is seen as a system, then it must have the principal behave as goal setter (leader) and monitor or evaluator of the outcomes to see to what degree goals have been attained. It is this last behavior which really cuts college of education faculties into two divisions—one large, the other small. The larger group maintains that monitoring of outcomes so threatens by limiting goals to measurable goals that instruction is thereby thwarted. A much smaller group, hopefully including trainers of principals, holds that goals can be measured and ought to be reported, and that outcomes ought to be used to assess the school's performance and to help modify goal structures if necessary. In the College of Education in which this training program took place, the latter group was small indeed.

The consequences of "c" were particularly disappointing in the first two years. The seemingly obvious fact that a Southwestern, or certainly New Mexican, public school

system must adapt to a cultural plurality by fashioning a curriculum which emphasized this plurality was not at all obvious to everyone. Cultural pluralism is a fact anywhere in this country if one digs beneath the most obvious outward appearances. Kansas, North Dakota, Minnesota, Maine, Michigan—all are composites of waves of migrants who settled in various localities to mine, farm, or do business. Samuel Lubell examined voting patterns of Jews, urban Irish, and rural Germans, and found strong consistent patterns within groups. In Nebraska the Bohemians who settled have a set of political and social characteristics which enable one to understand them and predict their community behavior if one analyzes them. The mining communities with their heavily Slav, Italian, and Finnish populations of northern Minnesota and upper Michigan are very different in their attitudes toward schools and related social issues from the German farmers of southern Minnesota or the Dutch small towns and cities of southwestern Michigan. The NIMH-supported administrator training program attempted to turn out school administrators who could understand, work with, and build upon such characteristics, and in time make school systems more responsive to such cultural differences.

Cultural differences are not just a Southwestern U.S. phenomenon, but are present all across the country. Each State presents an interesting and challenging social atlas which provides challenges to sensitive school administrators. Florence Kluckhohn's work in value differences in the Boston, Massachusetts, and Ramah, New Mexico, areas found cultural patterns evident in both areas. An administrator using cultural differentiation as a conceptual tool can function as easily and effectively in Kansas as in New Mexico.

Affect must be forced into the school system by the principal. But he is not prepared for this in his preparation programs. The great principals who are leaders in their communities come to know that affect is necessary to mediate the harshness and unfeeling of the public school system. The "Desi Bacas" do it.

The Spanish-speaking professionals are prepared in an Anglo graduate system to administer an Anglo school system. In their training period they are immersed in the norms of the system. Most of all they have come from immersion in the bureaucratic system and are recommended for promotion as they adapt to the system. To the degree that an aspiring teacher behaves as if he had a classroom full of middle-class Anglos, he will be rewarded for advancement to administration in the system. He cannot let affect play too powerful a part—not until he has his principalship, anyway.

The public school system and colleges of education which train for them do not necessarily wish to stamp out other cultures. The system is geared to encouraging the use of English and the process of Americanization—for preparation of the student to enter the job world, which is surely an Anglo-dominated world. Business and industry are Anglo cultural products in the country.

The cultural dilemma facing public schools and colleges of education is that if one makes too much accommodation to the non-Anglo child's culture, one presumably does that child a disservice in preparing him for employment. However, our society now is in shock—from confrontation by minority groups who are claiming not only equal job and educational opportunity, but the right to keep their cultural values intact. Universities must grapple with this dilemma. They must experiment with ways to help keep

subcultures intact while changing, and yet allow the young to participate fully in America's economic and social systems. Corporations and government agencies are working hard on this now. The hope is that universities will work as hard on this problem as the rest of our society is working on it. Here is where a university should lead, not follow.

As the professional educators in New Mexico had spent enormous effort establishing an Anglo-oriented public school system and replacing local norms with a national school norm, it is hardly surprising that a sudden change could be expected toward embracing local norms once more. Too many battles had been fought over certification, accreditation, and tenure which fastened the national professional norms on this system to expect that all of this could be so easily and quickly changed. Local norms connoted the word "political" in the school system, and politics were evil—they threatened professional judgment and control.[3]

As Title I, ESEA, and Head Start began to have impact on school systems, local norms became more evident once more in the district through the use of teacher aides. Educators in New Mexico, including the Dean of the College of Education of UNM, promoted the idea of extensive training by colleges of education for para- or sub-professionals. A two-year program was proposed for teacher aides in 1968. This would, of course, professionalize the non-professionals and force the hallowed national norms again upon the local system.

In reference to "d"—in order to elicit affective, as well as cognitive, commitment to the importance of the nature of community—the NIMH program required trainees to live in the community under study for a period of time. In order to evaluate the trainee's performance in the community as observer and participant, evaluation by staff members in the community was necessary.

Placing trainees in communities for this purpose led to problems within the project staff. Two of the staff felt strongly that this procedure was exceptionally risky and that a tight leash on the trainees was required as they might embarrass the University. There was no doubt that a trainee indeed might do something controversial and so cause some in the community to wonder what the trainee was "up to." This led to a temporary but important rift in the training staff concerning the usefulness of field work. The director insisted that the trainees be trusted to perform field work, and in fact no problems of the kind anticipated did occur. One incident did take place in the field which led two trainees to question the personal judgment of another trainee. This particular incident found the staff again divided on the merits of field training. Eventually, this division evaporated as the trainees proved their competence in the first round of field work.

The same question arose the second year when trainees were assigned to State agencies. The question was asked in the State capital by one or two people, "What are all those graduate students from the University doing up here?" The agency staffs with whom the trainees worked were in all but one case satisfied with their presence and work, so that at the end of the second year this procedure again appeared to the NIMH training staff to be a sound one.

Point "e"—working experimentally with a program required testing and evaluation of procedures. The evaluation in most cases consisted of staff judgments as to whether

the trainees gained insights from the experience. Field experiences were judged to be generally valuable, while the group dynamics or couch sessions were held valuable the first year, but were not the second year. The staff felt that traditional and competitive marking for evaluation of trainees was valuable, but the trainees did not. Participation by trainees in decisions about the training program was solicited and followed the first year, but not the second, as the staff felt that this created more problems in the College of Education than could be handled—that if the trainees' suggestions were not followed, it would depress their morale and mock their attempts at participation. At first the training staff attempted to foster group cohesion among the trainees; but after the first semester, the staff felt that competition and more individualized programs for each trainee were preferable to group solidarity. This latter decision was taken partly because some of the staff felt keenly that other graduate students outside the program and outside the department resented the "special status" of the NIMH trainees. The data concerning this feeling were never clearly evident and project staff members took the word of other faculty on this point. The NIMH trainees themselves were divided in their opinion on this matter.

With reference to "f"—the fact that this program was funded in a special way led to problems on the faculty which the college administration apparently felt were important. The special study area for the trainees was changed from a basement location to the second floor of the building so that they could be nearer other faculty and graduate students. The availability of money for travel and secretarial assistance for the project led also to some questions raised by other faculty, causing bureaucratic solutions to this apparent inequity. Unfortunately, this kind of problem all too often appeared to loom much greater than the merits of the program to the administration.

The relating of the foregoing details is not important except to draw conclusions about experimental programs in departments of a college of education. Those lessons include the following:

1. An experimental training program with far-reaching implications for other programs was not thereby popular. It was more threatening than challenging—threatening because the other programs lacked rationale; hence, one with a rationale was a witness to the lack of such rationale, or theoretical background, in other training programs in the college;
2. Personalities greatly affected the success of this program. The faculty which organized the NIMH program and constituted its "core" perhaps had too abrasive personalities or became too defensive when unfavorable comments about the program were made. And the staff was too naive in believing at first that the multicultural concept would be quickly adopted by the rest of the college;
3. The program was given excellent reception by departments outside the College of Education the first year as students went into those departments. However, as new faculty came into the other departments, the idea of cooperation lessened. Earlier, friendships and professional relationships had

made cooperation across department lines easy. But as new people entered the picture on both sides this changed;

4. A new program did not mean "better program" to all college faculty. The "ongoing program" was a phrase heard often from those who were not convinced of the desirability of a multicultural training program. The ongoing program was seen as threatened, undermined, cheapened, and confronted by the new. And all of this was perhaps true. A major misunderstanding on the part of the college administration was that this project and the "ongoing program" were at odds; in fact the new was to displace or at least influence the old. The project staff was not able to communicate on this problem effectively;
5. The change agents in the college were not popular. And some of them left, frustrated, if not disappointed. A climate favorable to change did not exist during the first two years of the program. This situation later changed. But then American society was forcing change everywhere on institutions, and the alarm bell had rung for universities. Change became not only popular but necessary. In the case of the early period of the NIMH program, however, change was "too early" and "too much." Legislators, the Congress, government, minorities, even the power structure now make program change in universities easier—in fact they are ready to punish institutions which do not show some readiness to change. But the earlier prophets of change are still no more popular than they were;
6. The NIMH program was to have been the model for the entire administrator training program. But it didn't turn out that way. The multicultural rationale wasn't bought in toto by the newer faculty in the department. Certain techniques such as field experiences and team teaching are residues of the NIMH project. Other rationales and concerns competed for this one, and much of the early NIMH project staff had left after 1966. Whether the department is better or worse is not a good question. It is a fact that in this day of fast-moving events, very mobile faculty, and fast-changing reputations of universities that program emphases must move faster than before, and residuals of experimental programs may wash out much faster than just a few years ago;
7. The greatest results and the most lasting residual of the program is not to be found in the college, and certainly not the university, but in the trainees and what they have done. They are the impressive result. They have changed many things. They have begun to change other people—their own students and associates. This was not predicted, but is most satisfying to at least the former director. If a program can really turn out a "new breed" of educator, it ought to be given an "A";
8. This experimental program left little residue in the University, except that three other projects housed in the University (the Home Improvement Project, a Civil Rights Project, and the Indian Community Action Project) are directly traceable to the NIMH program and the efforts of its trainees and

staff. The University intends, according to its new president, to become heavily involved in the effort to better the life of all the people of New Mexico. These projects are three efforts in that direction. Institutions as large as state universities change slowly. They change mainly by institutionalizing experimental efforts. In doing so, they inevitably "tame" them and accommodate them to the bureaucracy. But hopefully, they make a difference over the years;

9. Counselor training has probably been affected least of all by the winds of change. It is perhaps the training program with the least rationale. Even teacher training is now being examined and is subject to tests of theories for better instruction. The teacher training program at this University is now changing and is incorporating multicultural training, but not as a result of the NIMH project of 1964-67 so much as the pressure of events in American society. Universities can be changed by social pressures from without, but are remarkably resistant to change efforts from within; and
10. Sponsorship of a program change is important if it is to be adopted by more than one department for a limited time. The higher the sponsor of change in an organization the better the chance it has to spread in that organization. The sponsor of this program did not hold a high enough position in the college to affect its spread throughout the college of education.

Point "g"—it was recognized and taught that administrators who are change agents pay a price. They are more risk-oriented and ought to be because they have to move around. They are not necessarily well-liked. They may be better thought of, the farther away from their institution. They do not always see the fruits of their labors. They may have notoriety. But they do have the satisfaction of knowing that things can't be quite the same for their efforts, even in hard-to-change institutions.

Colleges of education have not been notorious for producing change agents. They have largely produced system-maintenance people. Internships in administrator training as in teacher training have largely been geared to showing the trainee how to get along with the system. Role models in the training institution have repeatedly lost their influence once the intern went into the classroom or administrator position. Role models in the school system were more powerful in their influence. They shaped the behavior of the intern or reported him unfavorably.

But this program attempted to select the role models very carefully and if an undesirable one appeared, to cut short his influence. The charismatic elementary principal in Barelas was a powerful agent of influence on the trainees. Administrators in State government who were very capable but disliked by many of the education fraternity became powerful influences on the NIMH fellows. Weak officials were recognized by the fellows in their internships as being just that, and they exerted very little influence on the trainees. Some quite unorthodox (to educators) figures in the State became "heroes." So the role problem was broken—at least this time. It can be again, by judicious selection. Herein lies the biggest problem in training principals or anyone else. Role models have to be analyzed, and trainees have to be protected from

the kinds of influence undesirable role models use to coerce trainees into system-maintenance roles.

Charismatic role models during an internship are precious—and unfortunately few, but they do exist. Desi Baca (principal of Riverview School in Albuquerque) had an influence on the trainees and the staff of the program which cannot be overemphasized. They tend to be unpopular with central office personnel or bureaucratic types in a school organization. One does not easily find risk-oriented individuals (who make the best role models) in tenure-protected positions. The creative people don't always need or want the kind of tenure that school systems provide.

There is no formula for finding great model principals. They know their communities; they are protective of their neighborhood's interests; they fight to bring the resources into their school; they take on the central district administration rather than submit to distribution of resources by formula (they try to beat the formula); they inspire great loyalty; and they try constantly to work for a better school and are perpetually dissatisfied with existing conditions. And they have a road map—they have the idea of the kind of school they would really like to lead.

Conclusion

In training Mexican American principals, program goals must be identified. These goals should not be restricted to cognitive goals of a type found in a graduate school. Such goals for enlarging the knowledge base of a person who wishes to lead a school or any organization are necessary indeed. But they are not sufficient. A way must be found to train the Mexican American to become a community leader as well, for schools with heavy Mexican American student populations are found in urban and rural areas often where leadership to improve social conditions is scarce. The interaction of social and economic problems with school problems calls for a strategy of training the Mexican American principal to improve the living conditions of an area, along with improving the school's internal climate and sensitizing the school people to neighborhood conditions.

Involvement of an affective nature is equally as important as developing a knowledge base. The Mexican American or any minority child must be made to feel that the school is his as well as Dick's and Jane's. This requires a commitment on the principal's part to restructure the school in order to temper the bureaucratic norms of the school, to provide experiences which clearly demonstrate the worth of the child's own culture and race, and to teach skills and values in an organizational climate conducive to good mental health. Marginality is inevitable in any case for the minority child as he prepares to compete in an Anglo society, but the school need not be altogether a shock treatment. Above all, the minority child needs to feel he has an advocate in the principal, not a cold, impersonal, aloof bureaucrat who cares only for the system. Caring for people, including children, is important.

One prepares for this dimension by using role models of good principals who make sure their teachers do teach skills as well as values, but who also show that they care for children and neighborhoods. Role models are most powerful as our experience has shown. Mexican American principals who are great role models are available, and they

do like to help interns. Their influence cannot be underestimated in the affective realm of behavior.

The program has shown that trainees could be encouraged to become agents of change. Principals must become change-oriented, even though the principals in the school bureaucracy are tempted to become status-oriented. Principals are encouraged to become bureaucrats; and the pressures of system maintenance (such as lunch and activity money counting, form filling, and supply acquisition) are overwhelming on the weak and mediocre. These behaviors drive out goal setting and monitoring, and provide rationalization to principals who do not really want to change their systems. Those principals who really want to change their schools may be unsuccessful if they work only within the system. The system is most successful in crushing creativity and discouraging goal setting and monitoring. Principals have to seek allies outside the system to assist them in changing their schools. This kind of strategy required stout hearts as well as sound minds. Recognition of where allies for change are located in the society is immensly important.

It is, of course, important that principals be given knowledge of what constitutes real change as opposed to trifling. Schools themselves may be incapable of the kind of restructuring required to educate all the children of a community. The principal who is aware of a system's incapacities as well as its strengths will seek whatever other educational resources exist in the community, and will encourage those who are going to drop out in any case to try alternate educational paths. The school, especially the high school, it seems, cannot really be a comprehensive school as it does not really comprise all possibilities for educating youngsters. The community and region must be seen as a school in a broader sense where other educational opportunities should exist for those whom the school cannot successfully educate.

Other criteria for entrance into graduate schools ought to be experimented with in addition to the usual tests such as the Miller Analogies and the Graduate Record Exam. Correlations between scores on these tests and administrator performance show such tests to be of dubious predictive value. For Spanish-speaking graduate students, performance on these tests is even of less value if they alone are used for selection purposes.

Exploration with criteria involving listening skills ought to also be attempted for graduate schools. They may add to predictive value of a selection battery especially for bilingual students.

The school is in drastic need of reform. The school as a school for Anglos needs as much reform as the school as a school for minority children. The school is still in the handcraft stage rather than in a scientific stage. While the school needs to be a better place for children of all cultures in a mental health sense, it also needs to be a place where children will learn more than at home or on the streets. The school is long overdue to enter this age of science, for if teachers are to attribute the learning gains of students to something other than maturation or gross exposure to media on all sides, teachers must identify goals and ways to attain learning goals. Even this elementary stage of science and professionalism is far ahead of where most schools in the Southwest are now.

A final note on the Mexican American principal. Although often referred to as the principal of minority children, this is not his only role. The Mexican American principal with his appreciation and knowledge of at least two cultures can be an ideal leader of any school. He should be able to demonstrate easily the merits of an open climate learning system. The Mexican American principal need not anglicize himself in order to become a good principal. If he assumes that good principals are Anglo principals, he is departing from exciting and valuable reality. The school need not be an Anglo system—it ought to be a multicultural system.

NOTES

[1]One professor wrote an article, "Lords of the Fly Swatters," caricaturing the use of Federal money in education.

[2]Tom Bailey, "Out of the Ground Springs the Hope of Life", unpublished paper, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, May, 1965.

[3]An excellent, if old statement on the dilemma of boards wanting to hire locals, with local norms, as opposed to the superintendent, who wants to hire outsiders who would be mobile and be non-local in outlook, exists in Willard Waller's *The Sociology of Teaching,* Chapters 4 and 5 of Science Editions, paperback, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., N.Y., 1965 (first published in 1932).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bailey, Tom. "Out of the Ground Springs the Hope of Life." Unpublished paper, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, May, 1965.

Bloom, Benjamin (ed.) *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, The Classification of Educational Goals, Handbook I: Cognitive Domain.* New York: David McKay Company, 1956. (Paperback.)

Croft, Don. *Communication Barriers and Community Action.* OEO grant number CAP 66-9116. Report.

Department of Educational and Administrative Services of the College of Education, University of New Mexico. "A Program of Leadership Training for Educational Administrators with Emphasis Upon Effecting Social-Educational Change in Multicultural Settings." Proposal submitted to the National Institute of Mental Health, Albuquerque, New Mexico, August, 1963.

Feiffer, John P. *New Look at Education, Systems Analysis in Our Schools and Colleges.* New York: Odyssey Press, 1968. (Paperback.)

Graham, Grace. *The Public School in the American Community.* New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

Halpin, Andrew W. *Theory and Research in Administration.* New York: The MacMillan Company, 1966.

Holemon, Richard. *Educational Administrator Training for the Multicultural Community.* Final Report for the National Institute of Mental Health Training Grant No. 1T1MH-08479. Albuquerque: College of Education, University of New Mexico, February, 1968.

Kluckhohn, Florence, and Fred L. Strodtbeck. *Variations in Value Orientations.* Evanston, Illinois: Row Peterson and Company, 1961.

Lynch, Patrick D., and Charles R. Griffith. "Progress Report, A Program of Leadership Training for Educational Administrators with Emphasis upon Effecting Social and Educational Change in Multicultural Settings." Albuquerque: Department of Educational and Administration Services, College of Education, University of New Mexico, July, 1965.

Lynch, Patrick D. "Report on NIMH Program, 1964-67." Communication to National Institute of Mental Health, June 6, 1968.

Morphet, Edgar L., and David L. Jesser (eds.). *Emerging Design for Education, Program, Organization, Operation, and Finance.* Denver: Designing Education for the Future, 1968.

Morphet, Edgar L., and Charles O. Ryan. *Designing Education for the Future, No. 3: Planning and Effecting Needed Changes in Education.* New York: Citation Press, 1967.

Sanchez, George I. *Forgotten People, A Study of New Mexicans.* Albuquerque: Calvin Horn, Publisher, Inc., 1967.

Seaberg, John, and Horacio Ulibarri. *Areas of Conflict Between Administrators and Teachers, A New Mexico Report.* Albuquerque: New Mexico Research and Study Council and Education Service Center, 1968.

Ulibarri, Horacio. *Educational Needs of the Mexican-American.* National Conference on Educational Opportunities for Mexican-Americans. Las Cruces, New Mexico: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools, 1968.

Vidich, Arthur J., and Joseph Bensman. *Small Town in Mass Society.* Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1960. (Paperback.)

Waller, Willard. *The Sociology of Teaching.* Chapters 4 and 5 of Science Editions. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1965 (first published in 1932). (Paperback.)

APPENDIX

Present Status of NIMH Fellows

Blas Padilla died in the fall of 1966, soon after renewing his professional career in the Denver Public Schools, and on the threshold of a new position in community affairs for that system. His example inspired the other fellows and the professors with whom he had worked. The Home Improvement Project is a tribute to his efforts, but more important are the many young men it helped and the families to whom it gave hope. A scholarship fund was established at UNM by his friends in his name.

Alex Mercure was an NIMH fellow for one and a half years. During the summer of 1966 he worked with HELP (Home Education Livelihood Program) which had been organized by the New Mexico Council of Churches to educate migrant workers. In February 1966, Mercure left the program to head HELP. This program has spawned co-ops, credit unions, self-help housing, arts and crafts (which have revitalized a great New Mexico tradition), adult education efforts of all kinds, consumer education programs, health programs, and community organization and improvement programs, to mention only a part of the repertoire of a very devoted staff of change agents.

HELP is not a remedial program so much as a basic development effort. The thrust of this program is to create lasting economic and social changes in the state. It has brought the attention of government agencies to social injustices that those agencies themselves were unwittingly encouraging. In so doing, it made government more mindful of its own clumsiness and of the hard feelings accumulated by Spanish and Indian people of the Southwest over the last hundred years. It brought the attention of government and private economic sectors to the need for great economic development in New Mexico. The Ford Foundation is assisting Mr. Mercure and the HELP organization in equalizing economic and educational opportunities for Mexican Americans. Headquarters for HELP are in Albuquerque where Mercure has his office.

One fellow who had begun a cost effectiveness study in a large New Mexico school system was later hired as the second staff member of the Educational Research Committee. This Committee, set up by the legislature in 1966, lasted one year; in that year it made a study of staffing practices and financial patterns in school districts of New Mexico. Based upon that study, the Cargo administration made its recommendation for a school foundation aid plan in 1968. While it did not pass, another finance plan based upon the same study was submitted by the Legislative School Study Committee in 1968—presumably for consideration by the 1969 Legislature. The author of that plan was Ron Coss, the NIMH fellow who went to the Educational Research Committee in 1966 and was co-author of the staffing study completed in 1967.

Tom Bailey headed New Mexico's part of the Rocky Mountain States' "Designing Education for the Future." The DEF project was designed to put the State departments

of education into leadership positions in their respective States by improving their planning functions. The New Mexico State plan emphasizes the need for an intermediate education unit. Designing Education for the Future has met with widely varying success so far, depending upon the ability and energy of each chief state school officer to comprehend and exploit the importance of the planning function. The success of the effort of New Mexico's chief state school officer will depend mainly upon his willingness to use the plan, which is the only comprehensive plan now available in the State Department of Education. Bailey is now involved in a special project for integrating the social sciences in public schools at Emporia State College, Kansas.

A fellow who became a Department Chairman of Educational Administration, I.V. Payne, of Eastern New Mexico University, has had a key role in program change in that institution's administrator preparation program. He has organized a school study council in Eastern New Mexico, and has organized statewide seminars on educational finance.

Bob Muncy, now of North Texas University, spent one year at New Mexico Highlands University. He has started to build a program envisioning the community as a cultural plurality and has organized several seminars and programs on the role of minorities in the public school. Nearby, another fellow, Amos Shasteen, is the superintendent of the Texas State institution for delinquent girls. The two are working on a program to bring the University and the Texas State school for girls into a joint program.

John Seaberg, who played a key role in starting the Home Improvement Project, became Assistant Director of the Southwest Cooperative Educational Laboratory in Albuquerque. He works with school systems and public and private education agencies in securing climates for testing experimental language materials for use with Negro, Mexican American, Indian, and deprived Anglo children.

Joseph Sarthory joined the State University System of New York at Geneseo in Educational Administration. An article of his will soon appear in the Education Administration Quarterly.

Rodney Orr led a research study effort for the State Department of Education early in 1967, after which he became the only fellow to secure a superintendency. He left after one year because he desired only limited experience as the chief school officer of a district. He is now a professor in a small college in Michigan.

The number of words spent describing each of the ten is not indicative or predictive of his individual worth. The writer has been located nearer to some than to others and this alone accounts for the variance in space.

The first class of NIMH fellows has been described. The second has not been—I leave that to another time as their work is just now beginning—two of them are here at New Mexico State University on the faculty, involved in Teacher Corps work.

The first fruits of the NIMH program, its trainees, have demonstrated change capability and power. Not all have been change agents to the same degree, and each has worked in a different milieu. Each must find his own if he is to be most effective.

ERIC
CRESS